

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

TRANSLATION
PCT

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

(PCT Rule 43bis.1)

To:

Date of mailing
(day/month/year)

Applicant's or agent's file reference

FP374PCTU431

FOR FURTHER ACTION

See paragraph 2 below

International application No.

PCT/JP2005/001188

International filing date (day/month/year)

28.01.2005

Priority date (day/month/year)

30.01.2004

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC

Applicant

NABTESCO CORPORATION

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- ☒ Box No. I Basis of the opinion
- ☐ Box No. II Priority
- ☐ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- ☒ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
- ☒ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- ☐ Box No. VI Certain documents cited
- ☐ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
- ☐ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

2. **FURTHER ACTION**

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA/JP

Authorized officer

Facsimile No.

Telephone No.

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/JP2005/001188

Box No. I

Basis of this opinion

1. With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.
☐ This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language _____, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rule 12.3 and 23.1(b)).
2. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
 - a. type of material
☐ a sequence listing
☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing
 - b. format of material
☐ in written format
☐ in computer readable form
 - c. time of filing/furnishing
☐ contained in the international application as filed.
☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table(s) relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4. Additional comments:

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/JP2005/001188

Box No. IV

Lack of unity of invention

1. ☐ In response to the invitation (Form PCT/ISA/206) to pay additional fees the applicant has:
- ☐ paid additional fees
- ☐ paid additional fees under protest
- ☒ not paid additional fees
2. ☐ This Authority found that the requirement of unity of invention is not complied with and chose not to invite the applicant to pay additional fees.
3. This Authority considers that the requirement of unity of invention in accordance with Rules 13.1, 13.2 and 13.3 is
- ☐ complied with
- ☒ not complied with for the following reasons:
- The subject matters of claims 1-12 refer to a constituent feature (hereinafter referred to as a "common constituent feature") related to "an eccentric oscillating-type planetary gear device equipped with (1) an internally toothed gear wherein an internal gear comprised of a plurality of cylindrical pins are provided along the inner periphery, (2) an externally toothed gear wherein at least one crank axle opening and a plurality of through-holes are formed and a plurality of external teeth comprising trochoid tooth marks along the outer periphery and meshing with the aforementioned internal teeth, (3) a crank gear that eccentrically oscillates the externally toothed gear by being inserted in the crank openings and rotating, and (4) a base that, along with supporting the said crank gear so as to enable it to rotate, has a plurality of pillar sections inserted in through holes."
- However, since the search found that this common constituent feature is disclosed in document JP, 7-299791, A (TEIJIN SEIKI CO., LTD.), 14 November, 1995 (14.11.95), Full text, Figs. 1-6, the eccentric oscillating-type planetary gear device is clearly not novel.
- Consequently, since the aforementioned common constituent feature does not go beyond the prior art, the said common constituent feature does not constitute any special technical feature within the meaning of PCT Rule 13.2, sentence 2. Therefore, there are no common threads running through claims 1-12.
- Since there is no other common element that can be regarded as a special technical feature in the sense of PCT Rule 13.2, sentence 2, no technical relationship can be found among the different inventions within the meaning of PCT Rule 13.
- Therefore, the inventions of claims 1-12 do not meet the requirement of unity of technology.
4. Consequently, this opinion has been established in respect of the following parts of the international application:
- ☐ all parts
- ☒ the parts relating to claims Nos. 1, 3-5

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/JP2005/001188

Box No. V	Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement		
1. Statement			
Novelty (N)	Claims	1, 3-5	YES
	Claims		NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims	1, 3-5	YES
	Claims		NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims	1, 3-5	YES
	Claims		NO
2. Citations and explanations:			
<p>Document 1: JP, 2-261943, (TEIJIN SEIKI CO., LTD.), 24 October, 1990 (24.10.90), Claims, Figs. 1-7</p> <p>Document 2: Microfilm of the specification and drawings annexed to the request of Japanese Utility Model Application No. 92941/1981 (Laid-open No. 23456/1982) (TEIJIN SEIKI CO., LTD.), 6 February, 1982 (06.02.82) Japan Utility Model Claims, Figs. 1-9</p> <p>Document 3: JP, 5-44789, A' (Sumitomo Heavy Industries, Ltd.), 23 February, 1993 (23.02.93), Full text, Figs. 1-7 & US, 5222922, A & EP, 527490, A2</p> <p>Document 4: JP, 7-299791, A (TEIJIN SEIKI CO., LTD.), 14 November, 1995 (14.11.95), Full text, Figs. 1-6</p> <p>Claims 1 and 3-5</p> <p>None of the documents cited in the ISR describes, along with reducing the ratio obtained by dividing the diameter (D) of pins constructing internal teeth by a certain pitch (P) of the internal teeth to an extent where the tooth tops of the external teeth are radially outside the inner periphery of an internally toothed gear, cutting off at least the external teeth in regions outside the inner periphery of the internally toothed gear to avoid interference with the external teeth and the inner periphery of the internally toothed gear. Therefore, the subject matters of claims 1, 3 and 5 are non-obvious to a person skilled in the art.</p>			

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

To:

CHOI, Hak-Hyun

3F, Woojoo Building 140-29, Gasan-dong, Geumcheon-gu
Seoul 153-801 Republic of Korea

PCT

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

(PCT Rule 43bis.1)

Date of mailing
(day/month/year) **02 NOVEMBER 2006 (02.11.2006)**

Applicant's or agent's file reference
PCT060815

FOR FURTHER ACTION

See paragraph 2 below

International application No.

PCT/KR2006/003211

International filing date (day/month/year)

17 AUGUST 2006 (17.08.2006)

Priority date(day/month/year)

31 AUGUST 2005 (31.08.2005)

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC

A47G 9/10(2006.01)i

Applicant

PARK, Jong-Hwa

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- ☒ Box No. I Basis of the opinion
- ☐ Box No. II Priority
- ☐ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- ☐ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
- ☒ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- ☐ Box No. VI Certain documents cited
- ☐ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
- ☐ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

2. **FURTHER ACTION**

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.
For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA/KR



Korean Intellectual Property Office
920 Dunsan-dong, Seo-gu, Daejeon
302-701, Republic of Korea

Facsimile No. 82-42-472-7140

Date of completion of this opinion

02 NOVEMBER 2006 (02.11.2006)

Authorized officer

CHO, Sung Ho

Telephone No. 82-42-481-5611



**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.

PCT/KR2006/003211

Box No. 1 Basis of this opinion

1. With regard to the **language**, this opinion has been established on the basis of :
 - ☒ the international application in the language in which it was filed
 - ☐ a translation of the international application into _____, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (Rules 12.3(a) and 23.1(b))
2. With regard to any **nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence** disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
 - a. type of material
 - ☐ a sequence listing
 - ☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing
 - b. format of material
 - ☐ on paper
 - ☐ in electronic form
 - c. time of filing/furnishing
 - ☐ contained in the international application as filed.
 - ☐ filed together with the international application in electronic form.
 - ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4. Additional comments:

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.
PCT/KR2006/003211

**Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability;
citations and explanations supporting such statement**

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Claims	1-5	YES
	Claims	None	NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims	1-5	YES
	Claims	None	NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims	1-5	YES
	Claims	None	NO

2. Citations and explanations :

Reference is made to the following documents:

D1: US 6895619 B1 (DENNIS GUN LEE) 24 May 2005
D2: US 5586350 A (FRANZ THONNESSEN) 24 December 1996

1. Novelty and Inventive Step

Claim 1 of the present application relates to a pillow comprising a pillow case and an embossing mat which is quilt-sewn in at least one direction to have a plurality of embossed portions and folded in multi-layers.

D1 relates to a pillow that can be folded or rolled into a plurality of configurations. D2 relates to a low-flammability pillow comprising a cushioning core and a cover separable.

The pillow case of claim 1 is disclosed in D1 and D2. However, the pillow of claim 1 differs from the pillows of D1 and D2 in that the embossing mat is quilt-sewn in at least one direction to have a plurality of embossed portions. In addition, the technical feature of claim 1 is not rendered obvious to a person skilled in the art.

Accordingly, claim 1 is not anticipated by the prior art, nor obvious to a person skilled in the art. Therefore, the subject-matter of claim 1 is considered novel and inventive according to Article 33(2) and (3) PCT.

Claims 2-5 are dependent on claim 1 and consequently they are also considered novel and inventive according to Article 33(2) and (3) PCT.

2. Industrial Applicability

Claims 1-5 are industrially applicable according to Article 33(4) PCT.